



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/017,858

12/14/2001

Stephen Schleicher

21464-301100

7128

29989

7590

09/12/2006

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

APPLE, KIRSTEN SACHWITZ

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3693

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/017,858	SCHLEICHER, STEPHEN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kirsten S. Apple	3693	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/28/02-12/19/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

Detailed Action

This action is in response to the application filed on 12/14/2001.

Priority

No claim for priority has been made in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ewald (US Patent Publication 2003/0014384).

Re claim 1 & 12: Ewald discloses:

A method & system for exchanging documents in a hub (see Ewald, abstract),
comprising:
Setting up an agreement joining document type and partner (see Ewald, Figure 2, item
36)
Placing file in receiving location – password protected (see Ewald, Figure 2, item 38)
Retrieving document(see Ewald, Figure 2, item 54)
Validating document against respective agreement(see Ewald, Figure 2, item 56)

Mapping document format (see Ewald, Paragraph 15, “independent of content and format” – it is inherent it would need to map as necessary different formats to make it “independent”)

Assigning a key to document for future reference (see Ewald, Figure 2, item 38)

Processing the document based on agreement – rules of hub entity and rules of first partner (see Ewald, Figure 2, item 102, 106 & 108)

Mapping document into altered format and sending to second partner based on agreement (see Ewald, Paragraph 15, “independent of content and format” – it is inherent it would need to map as necessary different formats to make it “independent”)

Re claim 2 & 13: Ewald discloses:

Agreement defines business rules – how to send, receive and format (see Ewald, Figure 2, item 102, 106 & 108)

Re claim 3 & 14: Ewald discloses:

Key is unique to document and set along with document (see Ewald, Figure 2, item 38)

Re claim 4 & 15: Ewald discloses:

Standard format is more flexible format, common rules (see Ewald, Paragraph 15)

Re claim 5 & 16: Ewald discloses:

Common process based on agreement (see Ewald, Paragraph 15)

Re claim 6 & 17: Ewald discloses:

Setting up the agreement involved creating a document-mapping between a partner's native format and the standard format (see Ewald, Paragraph 15)

Re claim 7 & 18: Ewald discloses:

Previously joined partners need not duplicate mapping (see Ewald, Paragraph 15)

Re claim 8 & 19: Ewald discloses:

Mapping to and from is document-type-specific (see Ewald, Paragraph 15)

Re claim 9 & 20: Ewald discloses:

*Document-mapping is created by using a graphical tool in a drag-and-drop fashion
(see Ewald, Figure 9)*

Re claim 10 & 21: Ewald discloses:

Once created documents are stored in a database (see Ewald, Figure 1, Item 12)

Re claim 11 & 22: Ewald discloses:

*Process is different by partner's business rules and policies (see Ewald, Figure 2, item
102, 106 & 108)*

Re claim 23-56

The claims 23-56 are similar to claims 1-22 except that 1-22 refer to 2 partners while 23-56 refer to partners specific to a supply chain where the document is being purchased. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that these claim have similar limitation. Therefore, claims 23-56 are rejected based on the information provided regarding claims 1-22.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Yong, U.S. Patent Publication No 2001/0051878, discloses hub-to-hub exchange.

Royal, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0027459, teaches electronic document exchange.

Ingersoll, U.S. Patent No. 7,013,426, teaches exchanging document versions.


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kirsten S. Apple whose telephone number is 571.272.5588. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-6126.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ksa


ELLA COLBERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER